

Remarks

This communication is considered fully responsive to the first Office Action mailed October 5, 2005. Claims 1-20 were examined. Claims 1-16 and 20 stand rejected. Claims 17-19 are objected to. Claims 10 and 15 are amended to correct minor typographical errors and not for reasons of patentability. No claims are canceled. No new claims have been added. Reexamination and reconsideration of claims 1-20 are respectfully requested.

Drawing Objections

The Office Action objected to the drawings because in Figure 6 the “reference character ‘50’ has been used to designate both laptop computer 52 and telematics system 24.” Applicant respectfully traverses this objection. In the specification, Applicant uses the reference character 50 to designate host devices generally, such as, e.g., the laptop computer 52 and telematics system 24. See page 6, lines 28-30 of the specification. No correction to the drawings is believed to be necessary.

The Office Action also objected to the drawings because “the top 78 should be 68 for the back of the seat.” Applicant appreciates the Examiner noting this typographical error in Figures 4 and 5, and submits new formal drawings to address the drawing objections. No new matter is introduced by this correction, and Applicant respectfully requests that the new Figures 4 and 5 be entered.

Claim Objections

The Office Action objected to claim 10 as not being clear whether the chamber is just receiving the printer or receiving both the printer and the passenger seat. Applicant believes that claim 10, as amended, addresses the Examiner's concern.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant appreciates that the Examiner has indicated allowable subject matter in claims 17-19, however, Applicant believes that the remaining claims are also allowable for the reasons set forth below.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. 102(a) - Takumi

The Office Action rejected claims 10 and 12-15 under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Japanese Patent No. JP 2001-328310 to Takumi (hereinafter referred to as "Takumi"). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The invention recited in claims 10 and 12-15 of Applicant's patent application was conceived before the earliest priority date of Takumi (i.e., the "reference date"), and is coupled with due diligence from prior to the reference date to the filing date of Applicant's patent application. In support thereof, Applicant submits the attached Rule 131 affidavit and exhibits cited therein. Accordingly, Takumi is not available as a reference and claims 10 and 12-15 should be allowable.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. 102(e) - Rigo

The Office Action rejected claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. US 2002/0049535 to Rigo, et al. (hereinafter referred to as “Rigo”). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 1 positively recites “said telematics system serving as a host device for commanding the printer.” Rigo fails to disclose at least these recitations.

The Office Action cites to the second half of paragraph 0041 in Rigo as disclosing this recitation. However, Rigo states that a “printer 52 can print out information, such as a directions [sic] to one of the hospitality facilities, if the driver commands the computer to print” (emphasis added). There is no teaching or suggestion that a telematics system serves as a host device for commanding the printer. Therefore, claim 1 is believed to be allowable over Rigo and Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1.

Claim 2 depends from claim 1, which is believed to be allowable. Therefore, claim 2 is also believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1 and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 2 is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. 103(a) - Takumi and Rigo

The Office Action rejected claims 3-9 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takumi in view of Rigo. The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The invention recited in claims 3-9 and 11 of Applicant's patent application was conceived before the earliest priority date of Takumi (i.e., the "reference date"), and is coupled with due diligence from prior to the reference date to the filing date of Applicant's patent application. In support thereof, Applicant submits the attached Rule 131 affidavit and exhibits cited therein. Accordingly, Takumi is not available as a reference and the Section 103 rejection is moot. Accordingly, claims 3-9 and 11 should be allowable.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. 103(a) - Takumi and Austin

The Office Action rejected claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takumi in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,665,089 to Austin, et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Austin"). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The invention recited in claim 16 of Applicant's patent application was conceived before the earliest priority date of Takumi (i.e., the "reference date"), and is coupled with due diligence from prior to the reference date to the filing date of Applicant's patent application. In support thereof, Applicant submits the attached Rule 131 affidavit and exhibits cited therein. Accordingly, Takumi is not

available as a reference and the Section 103 rejection is moot. Accordingly, claim 16 should be allowable.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. 103(a) - Takumi and Pascal

The Office Action rejected claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takumi in view of French Patent No. FR 2779695 to Bertrand Belanger Pascal (hereinafter referred to as “Pascal”). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The invention recited in claim 20 of Applicant’s patent application was conceived before the earliest priority date of Takumi (i.e., the “reference date”), and is coupled with due diligence from prior to the reference date to the filing date of Applicant’s patent application. In support thereof, Applicant submits the attached Rule 131 affidavit and exhibits cited therein. Accordingly, Takumi is not available as a reference and the Section 103 rejection is moot. Accordingly, claim 20 should be allowable.

Conclusion

By submitting the attached Rule 131 affidavit, Applicant does not make any admission regarding the disclosure of the cited references. Applicant hereby expressly reserves the right to traverse the Examiner’s rejection on substantive grounds if necessary at a later date.

The Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this matter.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 12-27-2005

By: Mark D. Trenner

Mark D. Trenner
Reg. No. 43,961
(720) 221-3708

Attachments: Replacement Drawing Sheet
 Annotated Drawing Sheet Showing Changes
 Declaration Under 37 C.F.R. §1.131

Amendments to the Drawings

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to FIG. 4 and FIG. 5. This sheet, which includes FIG. 4, FIG. 5, and FIG. 6, replaces the original sheet including FIG. 4, FIG. 5, and FIG. 6. In FIG. 4 and FIG. 5, the top reference "78" has been changed to reference "68".

Attachments: Replacement Drawing Sheet
 Annotated Drawing Sheet Showing Changes

Replacement Drawing Sheet



Annotated Drawing Sheet Showing Changes

2/2

changed to "68"

